

SAMUEL LEWIS TAYLOR, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. ) Case No. 4:13-CV-1065-CEJ  
)  
UNKNOWN HULL, et al., )  
)  
Defendants. )

<sup>1</sup>See Taylor v. Purkett, Case No. 4:98-CV-170-ERW (E.D. Mo.); Taylor v. Wansing, Case No. 2:08-CV-4056-NKL (W.D.Mo.); and Taylor v. Francis, Case No. 4:12-CV-613-TIA (E.D. Mo.).

defendant Heather Unknown refused to assist him on June 5, 2012. Plaintiff states that he was not seen by a dentist until June 14, 2012. Plaintiff does not assert any further claims or allegations.

### **Discussion**

After reviewing the complaint, the Court finds no allegations indicating that plaintiff was in imminent danger of serious physical injury at the time he signed the complaint on May 23, 2013. Plaintiff's allegations address past misconduct only. As such, the complaint does not satisfy the imminent danger requirement of § 1915(g). *See Martin v. Shelton*, 319 F.3d 1048, 1050 (8th Cir. 2003). As a result, the Court will deny plaintiff's motion for in forma pauperis status and will dismiss this action, without prejudice to refiling as a fully-paid complaint.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **denied**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this action is **dismissed**, without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

A separate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 26th day of August, 2013.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE